



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XII.—ON THE DATE AND COMPOSITION OF GUILLAUME DE LORRIS' *ROMAN DE LA ROSE*.

Our positive knowledge concerning the date and authorship of the first part of the *Roman de la Rose* is wholly derived from the lines in which Jean de Meun refers to his predecessor, Guillaume de Lorris :

Vés-ci Guillaume de Lorris,
Cui Jalousie, sa contraire,
Fait tant d'angoisse et de mal traire,
Qu'il est en péril de morir. Michel's Edition, 11291-94.

Ci se reposera Guillaume,
Le cui tombel soit plains de baume. 11326, 11327.

Car quant Guillaume cessera
Jehans le continuera
Après sa mort, que ge ne mente,
Ans trespasés plus de quarante. 11352-55.

The query, which naturally arises, on reading these words, is how Jean de Meun obtained his information, and in the absence of any hints on his part we are forced to take refuge in surmise. It may have been derived from notes written on the margin of the manuscript of the poem, but it is more natural to suppose that it was furnished Jean de Meun by the persons who loaned him the manuscript. These may have been friends or even relatives of Guillaume de Lorris. They were probably his contemporaries. For he himself tells us that he was but twenty-five years old when he began his romance (ll. 21-46), while Jean de Meun asserts that he took up the unfinished work some forty years after it had been laid down. So that by extending this figure to its limit of forty-five (it is more likely forty-one or forty-two), men born in the same year with Guillaume de Lorris would not have exceeded the Psalmist's measure of active life,

when Jean de Meun began his sequel. Some one of these sexagenarians would have had the manuscript of the *Roman de la Rose* in his keeping. He would have told Jean de Meun about it, and finally produced it. Jean de Meun would have read it, copied it and added his continuation.

This explanation of the preservation of Guillaume de Lorris' poem and the sources of Jean de Meun's knowledge concerning the older poet's fate is the natural one, and therefore plausible. It is also supported by facts of a different order, which belong to the domain of negative evidence, but which are entirely pertinent. The more significant of these facts is the absence of any reference in French literature to the *Roman de la Rose*, until it was made popular by Jean de Meun. Such absence of literary allusion would point very decidedly towards the existence of but one manuscript, and this manuscript in the custody of persons who did not write.¹ The other fact is, that of the one hundred and fifty or more extant manuscripts of the poem none is earlier than the years assigned to its completion by Jean de Meun.²

¹The claim that Thibaut, the author of the *Roman de la Poire*, was acquainted with the *Roman de la Rose* before it came into Jean de Meun's hands, is considered farther on. Waiving this connection for the time being, I know of but three references to the *Rose* which may antedate the year 1300. They are found in a verse translation of *Solomon's Song* (in J. Bonnard's *Les Traductions de la Bible en vers français au moyen âge*, p. 164), which may have been made before the end of the thirteenth century, in Nicole de Margival's *Panthère d'Amour* (ll. 1029-1038), and in Mahieu de Poiriers' *Cour d'Amour* (see Tobler's *Abhandlungen*, p. 288). The first two references are to Guillaume de Lorris' part, the last one to Jean de Meun's.—In an article in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres* (year 1907, pp. 249-271) E. Langlois shows that Gui de Mori wrote a continuation to Guillaume de Lorris in 1290. Langlois thinks it more than probable that Gui de Mori did not know at that time about Jean de Meun's work on the romance. But as some fifteen years had passed since Jean de Meun had begun his sequel (which Langlois sets towards the year 1275), such ignorance on the part of Gui de Mori appears quite incredible, especially since Jean de Meun had translated Vegetius in the meantime.

²Gröber, *Grundriss*, vol. II, p. 735. Guillaume de Lorris' own manu-

We therefore do not see any valid reason for doubting Jean de Meun's testimony concerning Guillaume de Lorris. Its very indefiniteness implies a knowledge of the older poet's career on the part of Jean de Meun's associates. Consequently the time when this testimony was offered becomes of primary interest. It is generally accepted that the continuation of the *Roman de la Rose* was begun after Conradin's execution by Charles d'Anjou, in October, 1268, and before Charles's assumption of the crown of Jerusalem in 1277. For the poet includes the former event in his eulogy of Charles but does not mention the latter.¹ But the limits of this period may be narrowed by a few years. After the passage which tells of Conradin's death, there is this account of the fate of his ally :

Henri, frere le roi d'Espagne,
Plain d'orguel et de traison,
Fist-il morir en sa prison. 7396-7398.

This statement is incorrect. Henry of Castille, a notorious soldier of fortune, had in fact been handed over to Charles, and sentenced to imprisonment for life in the castle of Santa Maria in Apulia.² But when Charles died he was released through the intercession of Pope Honorius IV (1285-1287), and some years later (1294) returned to Spain. There he took active part in the troubles of the country, and in 1295 succeeded in obtaining the important post of governor to the king, a minor. Jean de Meun had been told of Henry's sentence, and had assumed that he had succumbed to his confinement, as prisoners usually did. Still, in order to speak of his death in such positive terms, some years must have passed since the incarceration, two at least, probably five or six. Consequently this passage could not

script, undoubtedly of inferior material and loaded with corrections, would hardly have been considered worth saving.

¹ See lines 7392-7395.

² G. Villani, *Cronica*, VII, c. 27.

have been written before 1271 at the earliest, and may not have been written before 1274.¹

Taking then 1271 (1274) as the earliest date for Jean de Meun's sequel and 1277 as the latest, and interpreting his "plus de quarante" as forty-one or forty-two, we get the years lying between 1229 (1232) and 1236 as the season of Guillaume de Lorris' composition. He would be younger than Raoul de Houdan, the first notable writer of allegory in French, younger than Gerbert de Montreuil, the author of a sequel to *Perceval* and the *Roman de la Violette*. His part of the *Roman de la Rose* would be contemporaneous with Huon de Méri's *Tornoiement de l'Antéchrist* and the Provençal romance of *Flamenca*. But unlike these productions it would have remained unnoticed by the public until it was revealed by the ambition of Jean de Meun.

Yet what of the relation of the *Roman de la Poire* to the first part of the *Roman de la Rose*? Did the author of the *Poire*, Thibaut, know it before it came into Jean de Meun's hands? Its editor makes this claim, and his conclusions have not been seriously challenged.² There is no question of the borrowings of the *Poire* from the *Rose*—unless we assume that the *Rose* borrowed from the *Poire*, which seems chronologically impossible, because the *Poire* contains a definite historical allusion. In extolling the charms of his lady Thibaut is emboldened to say :

Qu'onques ne nasqui sa pareille
Des le tens sainte Elysabel. 1639, 1640.

¹ As stated above, Langlois thinks Jean de Meun wrote towards 1275, but reserves his reasons.—Jean de Meun's error on the subject of Henry's fate is not without bearing on the poet's biography. Had he survived Henry's appointment of 1295, he would undoubtedly have changed the lines which took Henry's death for granted. That he did not do this would imply that he was not alive in 1295, or at the latest in 1296.

² See the *Roman de la Poire*, edited by Fr. Stehlich, Halle, 1881, pp. 9, 10.

The "Elysabel" of the comparison is Elizabeth of Hungary, who, after a short life of adversity, died in 1231, at the age of twenty-four. She is the Elizabeth of *Tannhäuser*. In 1235 she was canonized. Therefore Thibaut is writing after 1235. But we think that he was writing long after 1235, four or five decades afterwards, and for various reasons. Why should Thibaut transform Elisabeth into Elysabel? How could he assume that his readers had heard of a German saint recently deceased, whose life had not been connected with wars and conquests? Both of these questions may be answered by one answer.

Some time after Elizabeth's canonization—between 1256 and 1269, and probably in 1268—the Parisian poet Rutebeuf was commissioned to turn into French verse a Latin account of her life. The poem was to be presented to Isabella of France, queen of Navarre. Now in this version the name of the saint underwent a change in the final syllable. It became Ysabiaus in the subjective case and Elysabel in the objective.¹ The explanation for this voluntary confusion of Elizabeth and Isabella is obvious, and it may even be that the name of the recipient determined the choice of the saint. Rutebeuf's morphology is accounted for. Thibaut's is not. But if we admit that both form and allusion were given him by the vogue of Rutebeuf's poem, we see at once why he spells Elisabeth *Elysabel*, and also why he alludes to her at all. In other words, the *Roman de la Poire* was written after Rutebeuf's *Vie sainte Elysabel* had spread abroad throughout the reading circles of France the reputation of the young landgravine and the peculiar spelling of her name.

Other features of the *Poire* support this assumption.

¹ See Jubinal's edition of Rutebeuf (*La Vie sainte Elysabel*), vol. II, pp. 311-313, ll. 17, 29, 32, 37, p. 318, l. 200, etc.

The very words, "Des le tens sainte Elysabel," indicate a generation later at least. They are not the utterance of a contemporary. Thibaut's fondness for acrostics points to the last years of the thirteenth century, and Bartsch long ago noticed that the larger number of the lyric refrains cited by him are to be found in *Renart le Nouvel*¹ (1288-). So that all the evidence which can be gleaned from the *Roman de la Poire* itself would place its composition after the second part of the *Roman de la Rose*, rather than between the two sections.

If we may consider it settled then that Guillaume de Lorris wrote early in the fourth decade of the thirteenth century, in 1233 or 1234, the content of his work would be typical of its environment. The subjective imaginings of the poet would be supplemented by scenes alike realistic and narrative. And an analysis of the beginning of his poem furnishes this theory with a basis of fact. In the first fifteen hundred lines of the *Rose*, or more than a third of Guillaume de Lorris' whole composition, traditional, conventional material is predominant. Hardly does he introduce his subject before he is impelled to describe the spring time and his own morning toilet (ll. 46-128). Then he returns to complete his outlined plan with a purely allegorical delineation of vices and misfortunes, which he sees on the park wall (ll. 129-462). His conception thus firmly established, he proceeds to win over his audience by pictures with which it was familiar, such as descriptions of the park itself (ll. 463-512, 635-730, 1293-1311, 1331-1424), in no way differing from the parks of *Thèbes*, *Floire et Blanchefleur*, *Cligès*, *Galeran de Bretagne* and the *Torneioient de l'Antéchrist*, portraits of women and details of their dress (ll. 527-576, 803-868, 990-1026, 1059-1114, 1169-

¹ *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, vol. v, pp. 571-575.

1180), which recall the beauty and elegance of the heroines of *Mérougis de Portlesgues* and *Blancandin*, a eulogy of Gawain (ll. 1181-1196), and finally the story of Narcissus (ll. 1433-1514). And thru these scattered passages of objective composition, some six hundred lines in all, connecting them like a thread, runs the postulated allegory, persistent yet unobtrusive.

But portraits of maidens, delight in nature and tales from mythology are not peculiar to the first decades of the thirteenth century. They begin, as we know, with the beginnings of the romantic school of medieval France, with the great poems which seek their subjects among the themes of classical antiquity, with *Thèbes*, *Énéas*, and *Troie*. They do not indicate any particular date. But in the *Roman de la Rose* another scene is pictured which points more directly to its own time and surroundings. After the poet enters the shadowy park he follows to the right a fragrant foot-path, and is led to an open meadow, where a company of youth is diverting itself by treading the measures of the carole dance (ll. 731-780). This form of amusement was not, to be sure, an invention of the thirteenth century. It seems to have existed for many generations. Few poets, from Wace and the author of *Thèbes* down, fail to mention it. But only in the poems of the first third of the thirteenth century are the movements of the dance described. Towards the middle of the reign of Philip Augustus it seems to have been taken up by the nobility, and cultivated with all the ardor of a fashionable accomplishment. Its presence, therefore, in the *Roman de la Rose*, and the detail with which it is described there, are wholly in keeping with the custom of that generation.¹

¹ Our information concerning the carole dance seems to be mainly derived from *Guillaume de Dole* (1199-1201), *Mérougis de Portlesgues* (1210?-

From what has been said, it will be seen that objective material of a kind similar to the material which is found in romantic poems contemporaneous with the *Roman de la Rose*, or preceding it, forms a large part of the first third of Guillaume de Lorris' narrative, in fact over one half of that third. Yet it would not be just to stress the importance of this fact unduly. For the remaining half, or seven hundred lines, is purely subjective and creative, three hundred lines being filled with the portrayal of the figures on the park wall and four hundred employed in sustaining the thread of the allegory. What Guillaume de Lorris has accomplished in this beginning of his story has been to conciliate his audience. He has attained this result by judiciously blending certain essential episodes of his main conception with descriptions to which his hearers were accustomed. Having in this manner gained their attention, and at the same time led them to accept unconsciously his central thought, he is at last free to abandon the conventional allurements of current poetry and concentrate his talents on the development of his real idea. And this is what he does, without further digression than the long passage in which the God of Love lays down rules for the lover's guidance (ll. 2067-2592), and, considerably later, the fine sketch of a baronial stronghold (ll. 4409-4475). The latter description is wholly objective. But the rules of the God of Love, while not allegorical in themselves, are yet didactic, and do not noticeably detract from the force of the image which the poet is trying to present.

1215?), *Guillaume le Maréchal* (-1225-), the *Roman de la Violette* (-1225-1230) and the *Roman de la Rose*. The description given by Guillaume de Lorris ranks next in definiteness to the one given by the author of *Guillaume de Dole*. In addition to the proofs of its popularity at this time which these poems offer, frequent allusions to the carole dance, which occur in the Carolingian epic of this period, in the contemporaneous poems on the Crusades and in Gautier de Coincy's *Miracles de la Vierge* (-1220-), attest the favor which it then enjoyed in fashionable society.

Accordingly we should not characterize the *Roman de la Rose* as an allegorized *roman d'aventure*. It is rather a new creation, a romantic allegory which has assimilated to itself some of the striking features of the courtly *romans d'aventure*, and has made them contribute to the accentuation of its own thought. For half a century this end had been sought by writers both in Latin and in the vernacular, Jean de Hauteville with his *Architrenius* (1184-1185), Alain de Lille († 1202) with his *De Planctu Naturae* and *Anticlaudianus*, Raoul de Houdan with his more limited *Voyages* and *Roman des Ailes*, Huon de Méri with his pious *Tornoiement de l'Antéchrist*. But in neither Latin nor French had the ideal been realized. To combine the different kinds of allegory which were scattered here and there thruout the literature of the twelfth century into one continuous, consistent, romantic narrative had proved beyond the strength of any author. The accomplishment of this task had been reserved for Guillaume de Lorris. Alone of the poets of the day he succeeded in mingling fact and fancy in a work whose content and style place it easily above any of the efforts of his predecessors or contemporaries. The misfortune of it was that his work remained unknown to his own times. For had this new kind of imaginative writing received at the beginning of the reign of Louis IX the powerful assistance of the *Roman de la Rose*, we may believe that romantic allegory would have restored to France the sway of subjective composition, which had dominated its poetry from the days of the First Crusade to the disillusionment of the siege of Acre. Guillaume de Lorris gone, the *Roman de la Rose* buried, the repentant verse of a Raoul de Houdan and the personified chivalry of a Huon de Méri could not avail to check the inroads of an arid, desiccating realism. Another generation and the opportunity had passed, and even Guillaume de Lorris' sincere

and simple romance was destined to receive an erudite and cynical ending.¹

The sources of the *Roman de la Rose*, whether in the field of allegory or the field of romance, have been the subject of many thoro and productive studies.² Few details possessing any importance can have escaped such vigilant scrutiny. There remains, however, one passage, at least, which has not been commented upon, and yet which seems worthy of occupying a fairly large place in the annals of medieval allegory. It is found in one of the earliest—perhaps the earliest—of the *romans d'aventure*, in the poem of *Éracle* by Gautier of Arras. It was probably in the years 1166 or 1167 that Gautier turned into rime, for the diversion of no fewer than three noble patrons, the story of the rise of Heraclius from the state of slavery to the position of emperor of the East.³ In this poem we are told how the future sovereign, while still in bonds, had been ordered to select a

¹Other features of Guillaume de Lorris' composition, as similes, proverbs, and familiar expressions, correspond in general with the style of his day and do not call for particular mention. A notable exception to this uniformity is made, however, by the saying,

Lors feras chastiaus en Espagne, 2454,

of which no other example has been noted.—Also the name of “Fontaine d'Amors” (l. 1605), given by the poet to the spring in which Narcissus drowned himself, seems unique, though he at once adds:

Dont plusors ont en maint endroit
Parlé, en romans et en livre. 1606, 1607.

This name recurs, to be sure, in Watriquet de Couvin (–1319–1329–), a century later, but may have been taken from our romance. It is possible that Guillaume de Lorris invented the appellation himself, for the Narcissus spring and the instances to which he refers may be allusions to the story of that misguided youth.

²Preëminent among them is E. Langlois's well-known *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*

³*Éracle*, edited by E. Løseth, in the *Bibliothèque française du moyen âge*, vol. VI.

fitting bride for his master, the king. A general congress of marriageable maidens had been called, and Heraclius was to estimate at their just value their physical attractions and moral character. He goes from one to the other, as they are assembled, halting now and then before a maiden unusually endowed, but only to divine very quickly that soul and body are in no instance in complete accord. Finally he comes upon one who is physically perfect. But as he looks at her intently he sees that her modesty is not invincible. Or as the poet words it :

Je ne vi onques nule tour
 Rendre sanz plait et sanz estour.
 Eracles voit bien que li rose
 N'est pas de tel paliz (*var. oudour*] enclose
 Qu'il s'en fust pour folz tenuz
 Teus qui peust estre venuz. 2394-2399.¹

This metaphor is not an accident. It is too well formulated to be anything but a deliberate figure of speech, carefully considered by the author. Besides, it is not the only place where Gautier likens a woman to a rose. For Heraclius, having condemned this candidate, pursues his quest and finds another, whose beauty and virtue are equally complete. But this paragon, on close inspection, is seen to be ill-tempered. There's a nettle near that rose :

Mais que l'ortie est od le rose. 2508
 N'affert pas a l'empereur
 Qu'il ait l'ortie entour le fleur. 2510, 2511.

And once again, when the ideal woman has been revealed, and made empress, her husband is warned against subjecting the "rose" to harsh treatment during his absence :

¹ In this citation I have used the variant for l. 2398, and have emended both l. 2398 and l. 2399.

Sire, ne malmetez le rose,
 Car s'ele est quatre mois enclose
 Tart en vendrez al repentir. 3136-3138.

There is no doubt, therefore, that Gautier deliberately typified a maiden by a rose, as other poets had probably done before him and certainly did after him. He had combined this simile—or some predecessor had effected the combination—with a metaphor in which the rose-maiden is protected against the enterprise of a suitor by a barrier-palissade. In other words, a poet of the reign of Louis VII states in outline the plot of the *Roman de la Rose*.

But how did this plot gain entrance into *Éracle*? Did Gautier invent the metaphor himself, or did he borrow it from some one else? Originality was not Gautier's *forte*. A more time-serving, eclectic writer than he can hardly be imagined. Still if the manuscripts agreed among themselves in making the barrier which defends the rose a palissade, we should hardly be justified, on general grounds, merely, in denying to Gautier the credit for this striking figure. The substitution of a palissade for a hedge is obvious. The poet had just compared a woman's virtue to a tower. Palissades formed the outer defences of a castle, and would naturally suggest themselves in any repetition of the comparison. "Paliz" must have been the word which Gautier selected. But why the variant "oudour" in line 2397? It resembles "paliz" neither in form nor sense, and is clearly due to the aberration of a copyist, an aberration which is apparently incomprehensible.

Possibly an examination of the lines in which Guillaume de Lorris develops the thought of his narrative may be helpful here. He has brought himself, the lover, to the Fountain of Love, and sees, reflected in its depths, rose-bushes covered with roses, and the hedge which intervenes:

Choisi rosiers chargiés de roses,
Qui estoient en un détör
D'une haie clos tout entör. 1624-1626.

When he turns towards the roses, their perfume greets him
and penetrates to his soul :

Et sachiés que quant g'en fui près,
L'oudor des roses savörées
M'entra ens jusques ès corées,
Que por noient fusse embasmés. 1634-1637.

At all risks he must pluck one in order to smell its
fragrance :

Se assailli ou mésamés
Ne cremisse estre, g'en cuillisse
Au mains une que ge tenisse
En ma main, por l'odor sentir. 1638-41.

But when he tries to reach them, briars bar his way :

Ains m'aprochasse por le prendre,
Se g'i osasse la main tendre.
Mès chardon félon et poignant
M'en aloient moult esloignant ;
Espines tranchans et aguës,
Orties et ronces crochues
Ne me lessièrent avant traire,
Que ge m'en cremoie mal faire. 1681-88 ; cf. 1808-14.

Or it was a hedge which stopped him :

Li rosiers d'une haie furent
Clos environ, si cum il durent. 2791, 2792.

And it is a hedge which Bel Accueil urges him to pass in
order to breathe in the perfume of the flowers :

Biaus amis chiers, se il vous plest,
Passés la haie sans arrest,
Por l'odor des roses sentir. 2809-11.

Finally, when the lover reaches the roses and kisses the

flower he had desired so long, it is the odor which assuages his bitter grief:

Car une odor m'entra ou cors,
 Qui en a trait la dolor fors,
 Et adoucit les maus d'amer
 Qui me soloient estre amer. 4081-84.
 Et quant du baisier me recors,
 Qui me mist une odor ou cors
 Assés plus douce que n'est basme,
 Par un poi que ge ne me pasme. 4382-85.

The real difference, therefore, between the plot of the *Roman de la Rose* and the outline of that plot as it is presented in Gautier's romance, lies in the part assigned by Guillaume de Lorris to the fragrance of the flower. That fragrance excites the lover's ardor, but also dispels the pangs of love when once he has breathed it in.¹ Now the variant to line 2397 of *Éracle* furnishes us with a hint regarding the missing factor. And because the variant, as it stands, is so absurdly out of place, we can excuse the copyist for his blunder in no other way than by supposing that the real situation has been interpreted to us by the *Roman de la Rose* (or by the verses of *Guillaume de Palerne*),

¹ Charles Joret's brilliant work, *La Rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge*, calls attention, on page 305, to the soothing effects produced by a rose on the lover, in *Guillaume de Palerne*. In a dream he receives a rose from his mistress and her attendant:

Dessi en droit a lui venoient,
 Une rose li apportoient;
 Tantost com recevoit la flor,
 Ne sentait paine ne dolor,
 Travail, grevance ne dehait. 1453-1457.

Guillaume de Palerne may have been written as early as 1190. It cannot be later than 1212.—A rose seen in a garden reminds the lover in *Blancandin* of his mistress, and he consequently kisses it. But the kiss does not at all alleviate his distress of mind (ll. 2605-2652). The author of *Blancandin* was probably a contemporary of Guillaume de Lorris.

and that in Gautier's original the part played by the flower's perfume was a prominent one.

Such a solution of the problem assumes that Gautier knew a poem which is now entirely lost. In support of this assumption stand not only the impossible variant of the line in question, but also the improbability that Guillaume de Lorris drew on Gautier's metaphor for the skeleton of his plot. Gautier had already deviated from nature by substituting the palissade of fancy for the hedge of fact. Had Guillaume de Lorris imitated him, he would have been obliged to carry the image back to nature, a proceeding which is contrary to the usual method of rhetorical development. Besides, he would not have found in Gautier's figure the deep significance which he attributes to the rose's fragrance. Another theory, of independent invention on the part of each poet, is tenable, but it runs counter to the ordinary opinion regarding the methods of medieval writers. When the same conception is presented by two or more authors of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the general conclusion is that the repetition of the thought indicates imitation and not originality. And in this particular instance the usual assumption is strengthened by the oddity of the variant in *Éracle*.

The existence of a third poem, therefore, would furnish the most consistent explanation for the likeness between Gautier's metaphor—including the variant—and the plot of the *Roman de la Rose*. This third poem would have contained the essential features of the story narrated later by Guillaume de Lorris. These features he would have made his own, as he did his loans from antecedent allegories, from *romans d'aventure*, from Ovid and other writings. From this third poem Gautier would have borrowed so much as he needed to complete his metaphor. A copyist, who was familiar with the contents of this third poem, and who had

been impressed by the importance it gave to the fragrance of the flower, would have unconsciously blundered at the point where Gautier, excluding this element from his comparison, changes the natural barrier of a hedge into the artificial one of a fortification. And in his confusion he would have written down one leading term for another, "oudour" for "paliz." That we do not find any evidence of the existence of this hypothetical poem, other than the inferences which may be drawn from *Éracle*, *Guillaume de Palerne*, and the *Roman de la Rose*, would not seriously invalidate our argument. Far more important works of the Middle Ages have failed to withstand the attacks of time. Still we should not wish to claim too much, nor lay too much weight on the plausibility of this or that theory. For the fact which suggests the theory remains here the essential point: that the metaphor on which rests the *Roman de la Rose* had appealed to another mind long before it was elaborated by the talent of Guillaume de Lorris.

F. M. WARREN.